

INVESTIGATING THE INDONESIAN EFL STUDENTS' ARGUMENT IN ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAY

[Dedi Turmudi](#)

Postgraduate in ELT, Universitas Negeri Malang Indonesia
Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro, Indonesia

tdeditur@gmail.com

Received: September 1, 2020

Revised: October 10, 2020

Accepted: October 27, 2020

Reviewed: September 30, 2020

Revised: October 14, 2020

Published: October 29, 2020

Abstract:

*This study investigates the written test results of the Indonesian undergraduate students' argumentative essay. For that reason, three research questions are made. 1). what is the level of achievement of the students in the argumentative essay quantitatively? 2). what aspects of an essay appear in respect to the argumentative essay generic structure as formulated? 3). how well did they use the rhetoric reputation and argument in their essay?. 27 handwriting' answer sheets of undergraduate English Department students enrolled at semester four of a state university in Indonesia were taken purposively. The data analysis uses a quantitative and qualitative approach. The results show that the students quantitatively achieved average score 76,74 which means good. All parts of generic structures were expressed in different quality. However; the organization of the essay is the lowest part compared to the other four parts respectively **content, vocabulary, and language use seen from their segmented scores**. This study is confirmed to be inline the previous study in that the majority of the students did not present the refutation section in both their English essays. This implies that teachers should be more aware of promoting this absent aspect as this refutation or rebuttal is a distinguishing marker in argumentative and discussion essays.*

Keywords: *Argumentative Essay; Argument; Generic Structure; Quality; Refutation*

INTRODUCTION

The current study investigates the written test results of the Indonesian undergraduate students' argumentative essay in respect to their achievement, generic structure and the flows of rhetoric in the submitted argumentative essay answer sheets as written in ink (Rusfandi, 2015; Stab & Gurevych, 2014; Bailey, 2011). The objectives are to find out: 1). *the level of achievement of the students in the argumentative essay quantitatively.* 2). *what aspects of an essay appear in respect*

to the argumentative essay generic structure as formulated. 3). how well did they use the rhetoric reputation and argument in their essay?. These three purposes are to give contribution to the body of knowledge of this genre.

Writing an argumentative essay may begin from any activities of writing as a way of knowing (Park, 2013) and as an identity (Lee, 2017)). In other words, maximizing learning can proceed through a writing output (Thwaites, 2014). However; the idea of an argumentative essay is also to promote the writing as a tool for learning (Lund, 2016). Then, the idea of why a genre matter is propagated by some researchers (Johns, 2008) and (Myskow & Gordon, 2010), while the genre concept I propose is the one extracted from Kamimura (Kamimura, 2000; Kim, 2006; Hyland, 2007; Lee, 2017). Henceforth this study focuses on analyzing how the existing theories of an argumentative essay writing are framed and how the students perceive and show their argumentative essay in an actual product in respect to the known generic structure and flows of rhetoric (Rusfandi, 2015).

Previous study in an essay writing has shown the positive tendency on how the essays; in any genre, promote students to learn what matters to them (Zhang, 2009). It is reported that an essay writing had the positive influence in enhancing students' learning. However, some information is left out; out of classroom bases, lower level students unable to produce 5 essays, and aged-differences (p.735-36). Despite the absence of a specific genre of an argumentative essay, I found it is a good reason to include an essay in general as the opening to go deep into an argumentative essay.

Another recent study in this field has shown that an argumentative essay is still within the focus which is in academic writing. Rusfandi focused on the presence and absence of four macro-level rhetorical features: Claim, Refutation, Sub-claim, and Justification and their overall writing scores as rated by appointed raters in the respective language (Rusfandi, 2015).

A similar sense of refutation or rebuttal is also called counter-argument (Bailey, 2011) and similar sense as quoted (Stab & Gurevych, 2014). The result of studies by Rusfandi (2015) showed that in general and the majority of the students did not present the refutation section in both essays. However, the quality of the individual essay and argument and counter-argument in his study are not judged. Consequently, the influence of such kind of rhetoric toward the persuasiveness of information revealed in the essay is not identified yet.

The absence of this factor implies that the writers reported in his study do not acknowledge other-side views. This type of essay is only applicable in an opinion genre but not applicable in both argumentative and discussion. In brief, I believe that the students' rebuttal or refutation are found in the prior study despite minor. However, their contribution to rhetoric is unjustifiable. Accordingly, this study tries to find the discrepancies by unveiling and judging the students' appearing rhetoric in their argumentative essays. Henceforth, the complexity of a rhetoric and its quality; argument, counter-argument, is the subject of current study despite being unpopular. I, therefore, focus on investigating this research hoping that I can follow up the gaps.

Further, some studies by different researchers have revealed similar results to either in the macro and micro components as I have proposed. Schneer (2014) has reported his studies stating that the main component of paragraphs does not appear to be the most common structure. He reported that there are not many researchers who focused on unveiling this the argumentative essay. What their construction; how it causes other parts, and why their spreading and dominating existed prototype is the subject of attention (Schneer, 2014,p.620). In his study, he has reported a crucial information that is worth exploring.

In addition, I have found out that his findings cover some issues. The opening moves and the analysis are shown to be a significant inconsistency between the opening moves of the conventional five-paragraph model and those of the opinion blog entries. It is clearly observed that the thesis statements are not always part of introductions(Rusfandi, 2015). It does not commonly appear to be in relevant with the three-stage template (thesis-argument-conclusion). Analysis results have also shown that there is an influential inconsistency between the opening moves of the conventional five-paragraph model and those of the opinion blog entries.

Nevertheless, his finding is finally in favor of prior studies by Myskow and Gordon (Myskow & Gordon, 2010)_who have also noted that the thesis statements are not always part of introductions. Last, but does not mean the least, I found that his study is outside of academic context and thus, the pre, during and post-classroom situation, as well as generalizable subjects, are left out.

Another study focusing on an argumentative Essay has been reported (Feliks, Tans; Liufeto, Gomer; M.Nalley, 2018). It shows that all assigned peer revisers had a different focus on revising process; particularly the absence on reviewing the flows of rhetoric in the argumentative essay.

They focused on the following aspects as quoted “1) word choice, sentence structure, and paragraph structure; and 2) mechanics. Aria, however, focusses her revisions on four major elements of a piece of writing, that is: 1) content (thesis statement); 2) word choice, sentence structure, and paragraph structure; 3) organization; and, 4) mechanics “(Feliks, Tans; Liufeto, Gomer; M.Nalley 2018,p.110). Thus, none of them did investigate the rhetoric flows of the argumentative essay.

Finally, I think it is important to part the type of an essay into different genres. As for argumentative essay or also called persuasive essay, it has been reported that teaching of this type is proven to benefiting the students’ thinking or at least it can enhance their EFL critical thinking element (Elsawi et al., 2015).

By far beyond this essence, a glimpse of discrepancies is identified to be uncovered in this study. Upon reviewing those studies, I am more challenged to investigate this study in order to contribute to the body of knowledge in the area of an argumentative writing.

These prior studies are believed to be sufficient bases for me to go further in this area. Thus, I am writing this conceptual theory of an argumentative essay to make me clear in determining whether an argumentative essay manuscript is really an argumentative essay or is claimed to be an argumentative one. Henceforth, the discussion is directed to the conceptual framework of an argumentative essay.

One of the many genre types of writing is an essay writing and in the more specific genre, an argumentative writing is one of them (Oshima & Hogue, 2009;Oshima, Alice, and Hogue, 2007; Bailey, 2011). A similar sense which is closer to the term of argumentation is proposed by other (Stab & Gurevych, 2014). Argumentative essay is a model of written text in which a writer presents his or her own ideas to convince or persuade the readers while at the same time he or she welcomes the other counter ideas called a rebuttal to make the ideas clear-cut; however, the writer has to take a stance in support or against the flow of the arguments. Students are inevitable to encounter this type since it is part of their skill. It is also to master as they can use it as a proof of their good command in English or English proficiency.

An argumentative type of texts has specific features called a generic structure which is different from the other genres. In an argumentative essay, the first-person point of view and the third person interpretation are presented. Thus the pronoun “I” and a clause “ I think,” in my opinion, in my perception” may present clearly. This is then followed by a counter and or a rebuttal

by the third person expressed in the third person pronoun and some phrases such as "other people think, the opponent may think that this does not apply to another party and so forth." In summary, when the statement of the first person is presented, followed by the argument(s) and scrutinized by an example(s), it will be challenged by the opponent in form of a rebuttal, an argument(s) and a contra-example. This is what is called a three-stage essay (Schneer, 2014).

On the other hand (Stab & Gurevych, 2014) has proposed that an argumentative essay has a crucial component called a claim that can be supported by at least one premise. The claim is a central component of an argument which should be controversial for the public. To best of my knowledge, I prefer to choosing the previous term by Oshima and Hogue (2007), Hyland (2007), Kamimura (2000), Bailey (2011), and Schneer (2014) as my primary sources. By synthesizing their work, I decided to take a common sense in that I use similar terms. Thus, an argumentative essay has macro components and micro components. The macro components refer to a structure of an essay as cited in (Schneer, 2014).

“(1) a thesis, containing an attention grabber, background information, and the writer’s position; (2) an argument, containing paragraphs which support and provide evidence for a proposition; and (3) a conclusion, which reaffirms the writer’s position” (Schneer, 2014,p.621).

The other researchers have formulated the similar senses, yet with details in the micro-components. Kamimura (Kamimura, 2000)_as cited in Schneer (Schneer, 2014) has divided the argument stage into two sections; an argument and a rebuttal, and a discussion and opinion” (Schneer, 2014,p.621), however; in the comprehensive one there has to be a thesis stage, inclusive of an evaluation, or a thesis statement, at the beginning, and a conclusion stage at the end. This is a model of the three stages of an argumentative essay.

On the other hand, what I meant by a micro-component is the components that have to be present in each paragraph (body paragraphs). They are a statement, an argument(s), and an example(s) and a counter-rebuttal, an argument and an example(s) which is followed by a discussion and ended with a recommendation by the writer as his or her stance.

This applies to all paragraphs, yet the flow merely depends on the thesis statement proposed in the introduction. At the end of the paragraph called "concluding paragraph," the position of the

writer has to be stated clearly to convince the readers. This is what makes it different from the discussion essays.

Upon all my final synthesizing processes, I have formulated a conceptual framework of an argumentative essay which will be used to judge if the students' works indicate this type of the essay or not. Therefore, the concept covers several aspects of both macro and micro scrutinized as follow. This framework is mainly on the basis of Oshima and Hogue and Smalley and Rutten, 1986; Oshima and Hogue, 2009; Hogue, 2008; Bailey, 2011; Silverstone, 1993).

An argumentative essay has to be (to have)

1. at least 3 paragraphs; an introduction, a body (ies), and a conclusion.
2. An introduction has to have, at least, an attention grabber or a hook, a general statement and a thesis statement or claim.
3. A thesis statement has to be a complete sentence in which a topic and a controlling idea are stated.
4. A controlling idea has to be a debatable topic in which the pros and cons are explicitly posed.
5. A writer's stance in the thesis statement has to be clear.
6. A controlling idea is the center of a topic in which both who are in support and against are welcome and further the ideas are developed in the body(ies) paragraph.
7. A body paragraph consists of a topic sentence, some supporting sentences or called arguments, and some supporting details or called examples, and followed by a rebuttal or refutation, some arguments, and some examples and is closed with a recommendation of the writer.
8. A body paragraph may be followed by a small discussion and some opinion before the writer states his stance as a recommendation function to reaffirm the position.
9. Another body paragraph applies the same rules as the previous one.
10. Concluding paragraph can be a restatement of both cons and pros but ended with a clear position of the writer and thus the sentence flows can be from summaries to a conclusion (inductive reasoning) or a conclusion to summaries (deductive reasoning).

All of these criteria will be used as my drawing board on judging the students' work.

Upon all reviewing the theoretical and the recent studies, I intend to do this research and thus, I have set research questions:

1. *What is the level of achievement of the students in the argumentative essay quantitatively?*
2. *what aspects of an essay appear in respect to the argumentative essay generic structure as formulated?*
3. *how well did they use the rhetoric reputation and argument in their essay?.*

METHOD

The design of this study is a case study with a descriptive qualitative (Vinet & Zhedanov, 2010) and criteria content analysis (Miles et al., 2014);. This study is conducted in an English Department of a state university in Malang Indonesia.

Participant

The subject is the students at English Department of *Universitas Negeri Malang* (UM) East Java Indonesia, who had taken an essay class and had been taught with argumentative essay theories. There are 27 students who took this course and all of them took the test as well. Their answer sheets were submitted to the testers as the test was over.

Instrument

The instrument uses a test of argumentative essay writing. The test prompt has been provided on a separated paper from the answer sheet. The topics are selected from the IELTS questions model with modification as needed. The subjects may choose one question only and respond the prompt in an argumentative way. The desired essay product is 250-300 words in ink and folio answer sheet.

Data Collecting Technique

The data collecting technique begins with the introduction to the test consecutively and the real test. This instrument is distributed at the same time after the direction to the test. The students had to answer the test by writing an essay in ink based on given topic they chose. They have 100

minutes long to finish their essay including direction. As they are doing the test, no electronic devices and dictionaries are prohibited. However, they are allowed to make a draft with no additional time given. When they have finished doing this test, the lecturer collects their answer sheets.

Data Analysis Technique

The data analysis technique is on the basis of both quantitative data (Trace et al., 2017) and qualitative data analysis for the essay test (Miles et al., 2014). The quantitative data used score scoring rubric with adaptation in the organization aspect. While the score of the essay is 100 in scale which comprises organization (30), content (25), vocabulary (20), language use (20), Mechanic (5). This scale is adopted and adapted from (Trace et al., 2017). For that reason, the researcher has formed a rubric for judging the test accommodated the generic structure and the rhetoric flows of arguments which are extracted from another writer (Oshima & Hogue, 2009; Hogue, 2008 ;Bailey, 2011;Turmudi, 2017).

Further, the same data was collected, coded, and judged based on the conceptual content analysis (CCA), coded, categorized, clustered under the theme, described and graded quantitatively such as poor, average, good, very good, excellent. The criteria are on the basis of quantitative interval score converted into the qualitative score. This criterion is adopted and adapted from the Score Guideline of FKIP UM, academic bureau (*Universitas Negeri Malang*).

This rubric is created to focus on the work and stick to the formulated criteria of the test. A table of a descriptive result is presented and compared among the aspects of an argumentative essay; a thesis, some arguments or supporting evidence (Silverstone, 1993), a rebuttal, and a reiteration or recommendation. Thus, there is not any inferential statistics applied in this study. The full table can be seen in appendix 3,4 and 5.

As all data were gained, then they were **coded** and **graded** to get the quantitative grades. This was done by two different raters only: the researcher and an outsider rater. However, the researcher did intra-rater. He scored all data and calculated the result once. After two days, he did the same without consulting with the first result. Another rater did the grading separately without knowing with each other. Further, the three different scores from different raters were summed and subtracted by three and the result is believed to be the valid quantitative score.

The whole process of writing style follows the model of APA style 6th edition while the intext and list of references are aided by a referencing tool Mendeley desktop (Turmudi, 2020).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study tries to answer three different research questions and thus the following are the findings presented based on the lead in of the research questions.

Result

1. What is the level of achievement of the EFL students in an argumentative essay?

Having analyzed the raw data, I found out that the students got average to excellent scores quantitatively. This result is then categorized based on the existing standard of scoring called ‘*Pedoman Penilaian Akademik (Academic Scoring Guide) of Universitas Negeri Malang* (See appendix 1). Then the result is clustered based on the qualitative categories; poor, average, satisfactory, good, very good, and excellent. (See appendix 2: Table of the Final Scores).

Table of Successive Scoring and Ranks

Score Interval	Qualitative	Frequency	Percentage
85-100	Excellent	4	14,81%
80-84	Very Good	5	18,5 %
75-79	Good	10	37,03%
70-74	Satisfactory	4	14,81%
65-69	Average	4	14,81%
60-64			
55-59	Poor	0	%
40-54			
0-39	Fail	0	0%
Total			100%

The above table shows that the most students attained good scores (37,03 %), while the minor portion is respectively achieved average scores (14,81%) and satisfactory scores (14,81%). The rest majority achieved very good scores (18,5%) and excellent scores (14,81%). This score describes that quantitatively the students have met the certain target of achievement marked by

none of them has a poor score. Further, the same essays are analyzed based on the category of an internal structure of the essay which is summarized in the following table.

Table of the Average Scores in Respect to the parts of the essay.

Types of Score	Organization	Content	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanic
Maximum	30	25	20	20	5
Average of 27 essays	21.55	18.5	17.67	16.1	4.25
Percentage	71.83 %	74%	88.35%	80.5%	85%

The table shows that the average score for each category is unequal in the quality. It has resulted from the content category analysis. The aim is to elaborate if the element of argumentative exists or not. The result turned out that the average score of the organization is the lowest one. The rest percentage of the average score is respectively tailed by the lowest one to the highest one, content, language use, mechanic, and vocabulary.

After this process was finished then the researcher did the second data analysis involving a qualitative model called content criteria analysis. Thus, the result was calculated qualitatively and grouped into dissimilar categories; poor, average, good, very good, and excellent.

- 2. **What aspects of an essay appear in respect to the argumentative essay generic structure?.**
- 3. **and how well did they use the rhetoric reputation and argument in their essay?.**

Introductory Paragraph

All introductory paragraphs are ineffective. This ineffectiveness is marked by the common features such as too many sentences (6 to 12 sentences), not focus—not leading to the thesis statement, and trapped in many details. Therefore, the type of the thesis statement varies and is categorized into several quality groups; poor, average, good and very good. Only 2 students did get poor quality, 8 students got average quality, 14 students got good quality, and the rest 3 got very good quality; however, none of them got excellent quality. The parameter of each category is described in the following illustrations.

The first category of the introductory paragraph belongs to **the poor in quality**. It has a parameter; complete sentence, a topic, confusing controlling idea, not clear stance of both parties, and no transition at all.

Example:

“**Although** on a weekend they have a holiday it is not enough yet.

So, school should have along at least 3 times a year “ (A9)

Judgment: Poor ThS, the stance of both are not clear as no “ I” is presented.

The second category is **the average in quality**. It has a parameter: complete sentence, a topic, a measurable a controlling idea, a clear stance of the first person and a transition(s).

Example :

“**Therefore**, although school long holiday is needed by the students, **due to ineffectiveness** school holiday should be no more than two weeks “(A11).

Judgment: Average ThS but no clear stance of the first person and the absence of verb believe, or think, clear CI.

The third category is **good in quality**. It has a parameter: a complete sentence, a topic, a measurable controlling idea, a clear first stance and marked with a transition at the beginning.

Example:

“**Although** students need a longer holiday, I consider that holiday should not be more than two weeks because it can **decrease students’ motivation for school.**” (A4).

Judgment: Good ThS, clear stance of other and personal stance but too specific of CI.

The fourth category is **very good**. It has a complete sentence, a topic, a measurable and logical controlling idea, a clear stance of both parties, and acceptable transitions.

Example:

“**Although** some students feel that long school holiday is really good because it gives a lot of free time, I believe that school holiday should not more than two weeks because it has **some disadvantages for students (A12).**

Judgment: Very Good ThS, clear stance of both first and third and clear CI.

The full summary can be seen in the appendix 3.

Body Paragraph (1)

All of the subjects wrote their body paragraphs under the flow of a thesis statement. However, some of them achieved an average quality (6) and the rest gained a good quality (21).

The criteria of a good body paragraph must be begun with a topic sentence that has a complete simple sentence with minor flaws, a topic, a measurable controlling idea, and clear stand of the third party, connected to the thesis statement in the introduction.

Example:

“My first opponent stated that the more days students get for holiday, the more they will study they have learned at school.”

Judgment: Good TS, opposite the 1st person, CI = they will study more.

“In the end, these students will only play rather than a study which causes them all to forget the materials that have learned at school before.”

Judgment: Good CS, but not clear stance (first or third). The flow is not argumentative.

While the average body paragraph must have a topic sentence that has a complete sentence with minor flaws, a topic, a controlling idea, no stance of both parties but connected to the thesis statement.

Example:

“The first is when the students have a long holiday of a course they will be very happy.”
(A1)

Judgment: Average TS, does not have a clear stance, it connects with CI= some reasons = very happy.

“It must be an inspiration.” (A1)

Judgment: Average CS, does not have a clear stance and essence of TS. Aspects of controlling idea of TS is not developed.

Unfortunately, none of them met the criteria of very good and excellent category as described below:

“Very good has characteristics: Complete complex sentence, a topic, a controlling idea, clear stand of the third party, connected to Thesis statement.”

While Excellent has criteria: “Complete compound-complex sentence, a topic, a measurable controlling idea, clear stand of the third party, connected to ThS.”

The full summary can be seen in the appendix 4.

Body Paragraph (2)

As for the body paragraph one, in the body paragraph 2 (henceforth BP2) they developed their arguments on the basis of the thesis statement; however, the result is not dissimilar. Seven test-takers developed their arguments in the level of average in quality. The rest 20 students established their paragraphs in the level of good category. This result is almost the same as the

prior paragraph development. The criteria of average and its example are presented in the following examples. What is meant by average has this criterion: a complete sentence with minor flaws, a topic, a controlling idea, no stance of both parties, but connected to thesis statement (ThS).

Example:

“As we know, holiday is needed for students.” (A7)

Judgment: Average TS and not connected with ThS, not clear stance, CI= needed for students.

“If the holiday more than two weeks, it is possible the schedule will be late “(A7)

Judgment: Average CS: not clear CS and the stance

While the criteria of the good category are marked with the following characteristics: a complete simple sentence with minor flaws, a topic, a measurable controlling idea, clear stand of the third party, connected to the thesis statement.

Example.

“My second opponent also stated that long holiday will increase students’ concentration later at school after some refreshment. “(A4)

Judgment: Good TS and connects with ThS, the third person stance, CI= increase students’ concentration.

“The result, in the end, the students cannot catch up with the learning process in the class.” (A4).

Judgment: Good CS, but not clear stance

The full summary can be seen in the appendix 5.

Concluding paragraph

As I read along paragraph 1 and 2 of each essay, I finally analyzed the last part of the essay called concluding paragraph. The criteria of this type leaned on the use of the transitional markers and the quality of the supporting sentences. The main character is differentiated by two different approaches: inductive and deductive.

The results show and represent the following criteria. 14 students used an inductive approach in which they began their sentence with different transitional markers such as “to sum up, finally, and in summary.” 8 of them used “to sum up,” 1 of them used “finally”, 1 of them used “ in summary”, and 4 of them did not involve transition markers at all. These results are also made clearer by the quality of their summary sentences; however, they are various. 4 of them achieved good summary, 4 of them attained good summary but without transitional markers, 3 of them reached average summary and 1 of them got a poor summary.

Example of Inductive approach

“ to sum up, the long school holiday should be applied because it has more advantages, which are much better. It will refresh the students to make them feel good to go back study and bring them to get optimum result in education. So, the long school holiday is really important for education” (A2)

On the other hand, 13 of them applied a deductive approach marked by different transitional markers such as ‘in conclusion, as a result, and to sum up.’ 9 of them applied ‘in conclusion’, 2 of them used ‘as result,’ 1 of them involved ‘to sum up’, and 1 of them did not use the transitional marker at all. Among those category sentences, they, unfortunately, did not follow up with a good conclusion. In fact, 3 of them ended their sentences with a good conclusion, 10 of them closed with an average conclusion. Further, 4 of them also achieved good summaries and 6 of them attained average summaries.

Example of a deductive approach

“ In conclusion, school holiday is needed but we should consider the length of holiday. The more longer the holiday, the more they become lazy people. It is not effective having a long school holiday. It is just wasting time and money, leading them to become lazy and leading them to become not productive” (A11)

All of these examples are extracted based on the distributed criterion and thus each category has the real example. Henceforth, the proposition is shifted to a discussion.

Discussion

This study tries to explore and investigate the students' work in both a quantitative and qualitative data. Therefore, the research questions to answer are (1). what is the level of achievement of the EFL students in the argumentative essay? and (2). what aspects of the essay appear in respect to the argumentative essay generic structure as formulated?. (3). *How well did they use the rhetoric reputation and argument in their essay?*. All of these are elaborated differently.

1. What is the level of achievement of the EFL students in the argumentative essay?

The first objective is to find out the level of the achievement of the EFL students in an argumentative essay. Accordingly, referring to the data analysis technique which was on the basis

of both quantitative data and qualitative data analysis for the essay test, I highlighted some points. The quantitative data used the score scoring rubric with adaptation in the organization aspect. While the score of the essay is 100 in scale which comprises organization (30), content (25), vocabulary (20), language use (20), Mechanic (5). This scale is adopted and adapted from (Trace et al., 2017). For that, the researcher has formed a rubric for judging the test accommodated the generic structure and rhetoric flows of arguments which are extracted from other (Oshima & Hogue, 2009; Hogue, 2008).

It seemed that the students have achieved average scores belong to "B." This calculation met with the standard score of the campus (Universitas Negeri Malang). It turned out that the students have achieved a different level of scores and attainments. Four of them (14.81% attained excellent score, five of them (18,5%) achieved a very good score, ten of them (37,03%) got a good score, four of them (14,81%) got a satisfactory score, and the rest 4 of them (14,81) got an average score. No one attained poor and failed score. In summary, this makes average score 76,74 which means that they got good score or equivalent with "B." Seen from this achievement, I doubt the validity of score, even though it has resulted from three different raters; two intra-rater which is the same rater and another one is a different person. For that, it is worth adding at least two other different raters. In this case, it is likely to happen that the raters are loose in scoring all categories except the organization which remains the lowest one.

The previous study by (Rusfandi, 2015) revealed that the majority of the students did not present the refutation section in both essays of English and Indonesian. In reference to good criteria of an essay, it should have at least; summary of opposing argument, rebuttal and the writer's own argument (Oshima & Hogue, 2009,p.146). Moreover, if it is compared to that of Rusfandi (2015), this finding indicates that the use of argument-counterargument structure had nothing to do with the students' L2 proficiency level, although the percentage of students who supplied the refutation section in the Indonesian essays was slightly higher (Rusfandi, 2015, p. 13). The current study, however; indicates the similarities despite the fact that the coverage of analysis is different. In fact, a quantitative calculation is absent in the study of Rusfandi, but it is present this study.

2. What aspects of an essay appears in respect to the argumentative essay generic structure as formulated?. and

Among the five aspects of the essay: The category of organization (30), content (25), vocabulary (20), language use (20), Mechanic (5), yet the organization is the most paid part as it consists of a rhetoric flow of the essay. In answering the research question 2: “*what aspects of an essay does appear in respect to the argumentative essay generic structure as formulated?*” All of these are elaborated differently. The fact that the organization is the lowest average in the score is in line with the fact that this aspect needs investigating. The rest four aspects are fairly better. They are respectively presented from the lowest to the highest one: content 74%, language use 80.5%, mechanic 85%, and vocabulary 88.35 %. The data implies that there is not significant difference in the gaps.

Looking at the summary above, in can be seen clearly that the lowest average achievement is in the organization of the essay which is 21.55 out of 30 or 71.83% compared to the other four parts respectively: content, vocabulary, and language use.

3. How well did they use the rhetoric reputation and argument in their essay?.

This result is found to have similarities to the prior study as by Rusfandi (2015) since his study focused on the arguments and counter-arguments, the relationship or agreement in terms of the presence of argument-counterargument structure in the participants' L2 and L1 essays?, the students' English L2 proficiency affect the use of argument-counterargument structures in their essays? the use of argument-counterargument structures affect the students' overall essay quality? (Rusfandi, 2015,p.5). While this study research question 2 focuses on what aspects of essay appear in respect to the argumentative essay generic structure as formulated. Compared to that of (Schneer, 2014), this study has similarity in that it is clearly observed that the thesis statements are not always part of the introductions.

Lastly, in comparison to the work of (Feliks, Tans; Liufeto, Gomer; M.Nalley, 2018), this study has deeper analysis in that the flows of arguments are dig and identified where they belong to. However, it does not reach the bottom root as it should be.

The analysis results have also shown that there is an influential inconsistency between the opening moves of the conventional five-paragraph model and those of the opinion blog entries.

This means that this study remains similar in that the absence of refutation is a common ground among students (Rusfandi, 2015).

CONCLUSION

Through this study, I found out that the level of student's achievement quantitatively has reached acceptable grades. However, I believe it is not fully reliable due to some external factors. In other words, it is less valid due to several causes; the timing of the test which is longer than the original test in IELTS which takes 60 long and the number of raters who graded the quantitative scores. Thus, the level of achievement is answered clearly.

This study is also confirmed to be the same as the prior evidence in that the refutation or rebuttal is absent by the majority of the subjects. It clearly indicates the understanding of the argumentative and the flows of the rhetoric of this genre needs emphasizing in exercise since this genre is basically overlapped with discussion genre in both sides present argument and counter-argument or rebuttal.

Future research: therefore, should concern on the time allocation for writing the essay, and the other aspects should be controlled clearly to make the result generalizable. This is at least, what I can make for the development of the knowledge of essay in the framework of academic writing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank Professor Bambang Yudi Cahyono, M.Pd., M.A., Ph.D. For guiding this article from beginning to the end by criticizing the manuscript in every development step. Most gratitude is addressed to BUDI-DN or LPDP scholarship program that has supported me to experience my postgraduate study at Universitas Negeri Malang on behalf of Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro.

BIOPROFILE

Dedi Turmudi was a senior English lecturer at Muhammadiyah University of Metro Lampung Indonesia. He received his master's degree from the SIT Graduate Institute or previously known for the School for International Training (SIT) Brattleboro, Vermont USA with ESOL as his minor concentration. He specializes his teaching and research on academic writing,

scientific writing, scientific report writing, ICLT, and teaching methodologies. He is a postgraduate student at Universitas Negeri Malang specializes in ELT program and projected to graduate in November 2020. Corresponding email: tdeditur@gmail.com ORCID ID; <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4803-5854>

REFERENCES

- Bailey, S. (2011). *Academic Writing: A Handbook for International Students, Third edition* (3rd ed.). Routledge:Taylor & Francis e-Library.
[http://libgen.org/search?req=academic+writing+bailey&nametype=orig&column\[\]=title&column\[\]=author&column\[\]=series&column\[\]=periodical&column\[\]=publisher&column\[\]=year%5Cpapers2://publication/uuid/424C3324-B527-4654-8B57-591F60B7C7C4](http://libgen.org/search?req=academic+writing+bailey&nametype=orig&column[]=title&column[]=author&column[]=series&column[]=periodical&column[]=publisher&column[]=year%5Cpapers2://publication/uuid/424C3324-B527-4654-8B57-591F60B7C7C4)
- Elsawi, M., Ibrahim, E., Sid, N., Eljack, A., Bashir, I., & Elhassan, M. (2015). To What Extent Can Argumentative Essay Writing help develop Learners ' Critical Thinking. *SUST Journal of Humanities*, 16(4), 54–66.
- Feliks,Tans;Liufeto,Gomer; M.Nalley, H. (2018). International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies (Ijeler). *Narrative*, 5(1), 99–111.
[http://www.ijelr.in/2.3.15/588-596 Dr. NENAVATH PADMAMMA.pdf](http://www.ijelr.in/2.3.15/588-596%20Dr.%20NENAVATH%20PADMAMMA.pdf)
- Hogue, A. (2008). *First Steps in Academic Writing* (2 nd). PEARSON Longman.
http://www.amazon.com/dp/0132414880/ref=wl_it_dp_o_pC_S_ttl?_encoding=UTF8&colid=34VCEHGG5K3UL&coliid=I184XMTXD9WLQU
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- Johns, A. M. (2008). Genre awareness for the novice academic student: An ongoing quest. *Language Teaching*, 41(02), 237–252. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004892>
- Kamimura, T. (2000). Integration of process and product orientations in EFL writing instruction. *RELC Journal*, 31(2), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820003100201>
- Kim, M. S. (2006). Genre-Based Approach to Teaching Writing. *TESOL Working Paper Series*, 33–40.
http://www.hpu.edu/CHSS/LangLing/TESOL/ProfessionalDevelopment/200680TWPfall06/07Kim_Genre.pdf
- Lee, S. (2017). Writer Identity in Narrative and Argumentative Genres : A Case of Korean Students in the United States. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.1p.178>
- Lund, R. E. (2016). Handwriting as a tool for learning in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 70(1), 48–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv048>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, M. a, & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications. [https://doi.org/January 11, 2016](https://doi.org/January%2011,%202016)
- Myskow, G., & Gordon, K. (2010). A focus on purpose: using a genre approach in an EFL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 64(3), 283–292. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp057>
- Oshima, Alice and Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing* (3rd ed.). PEARSON Longman.
- Park, G. (2013). Writing is a way of knowing': Writing and identity. *ELT Journal*, 67(3), 336–345. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct012>
- Pomeransky, A. A., & Khriplovich, I. B. (1999). Equations of motion of spinning relativistic particle in external fields. *Surveys in High Energy Physics*, 14(1–3), 145–173.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01422419908228843>
- Rusfandi. (2015). Argument-Counterargument Structure in Indonesian EFL Learners English Argumentative Essays: A Dialogic Concept of Writing. *RELC Journal*, 46(2), 181–197.

- <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688215587607>
- Schneer, D. (2014). Rethinking the Argumentative Essay. *TESOL Journal*, 5(4), 619–653.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.123>
- Silverstone, R. (1993). Vegetarianism — Food for the Future. *Nutrition & Food Science*, 93(6), 20–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000001008>
- Stab, C., & Gurevych, I. (2014). Identifying Argumentative Discourse Structures in Persuasive Essays. *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 46–56. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D14-1006>
- Thwaites, P. (2014). Maximizing learning from written output. *ELT Journal*, 68(2), 135–144.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct098>
- Trace, J., Janssen, G., & Meier, V. (2017). Measuring the impact of rater negotiation in writing performance assessment. *Language Testing*, 34(1), 3–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532215594830>
- Turmudi, D. (2017). Rethinking Academic Essay Writing : Selected Genres in Comparison. *Premise Journal*, 6(2), 119–138. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v6i2.1052>
- Turmudi, D. (2020). English Scholarly Publishing Activities in the Industrial Revolution 4 . 0 : What , Why , and How ? *ELTEJ*, 3(1), 52–62.
<http://journal2.uad.ac.id/index.php/eltej/article/view/1890>
- Vinet, L., & Zhedanov, A. (2010). Education. In *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* (4th ed., Vol. 44, Issue 8). Pearson Education, Inc. www.pearsonhigered.com
- Zhang, D. (2009). Essay writing in a mandarin chinese webCT discussion board. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(4), 721–741. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01051.x>

Appendices

Appendix 1

Conversion Quantitative Score to Qualitative

Table 1. Interval Criteria

Score Interval	Qualitative	Quality	Score
85-100	Excellent	A	4.00
80-84	Very Good	A-	3.70
75-79	Good	B+	3.30
70-74	Satisfactory	B	3.00
65-69	Average	B-	2.70
60-64	Average	C+	2.30
55-59	Poor	C	2.00
40-54	Poor	D	1.00
0-39	Fail	E	0

(Source: Malang Universitas Negeri, 2016)

Appendix 2

Table 2. Final Score

Code 1	Final Score	Qualitative	Criteria	Rank
	Rater1+Rater 2			
A1	64.7	Average	B-	27
A2	81.45	Very Good	A-	8
A3	69.1	Satisfactory	B	23
A4	78.4	Good	B+	14
A5	78.85	Good	B+	11
A6	67.15	Average	B-	26
A7	69.7	Satisfactory	B	21
A8	74.65	Good	B+	19
A9	67.7	Average	B-	25
A10	78.65	Good	B+	13
A11	78.95	Good	B+	10
A12	84.15	Excellent	A	4
A13	83.75	Very Good	A-	5
A14	82.45	Very Good	A-	7
A15	86.05	Excellent	A	1
A16	76.5	Good	B+	17
A17	78.85	Good	B+	12
A18	82.65	Very Good	A-	6
A19	75.2	Good	B+	18
A20	67.85	Average	B-	24
A21	69.35	Satisfactory	B	22
A22	85	Excellent	A	2
A23	78.35	Good	B+	15
A24	77.75	Good	B+	16
A25	69.95	Satisfactory	B	20
A26	84.85	Excellent	A	3
A27	80.2	Very Good	A-	9
Means	76,74	Good	B+	3.30

Appendix 3 Introductory Paragraph

Table 3. summary of Introductory Paragraph

Quality	Frequency Percentage	Descriptor	Codes	Sample of Thesis Statement
Poor	2=	Complete sentence, a topic, confusing controlling idea, not clear stance of both parties, and no transition	A9,A16	Although in weekend they have a holiday but it is not enough yet. <i>So school should have along at least 3 times a year.(A9)</i> Poor ThS , the stance of both are not clear as no “ I” is presented.
Average	8	Complete sentence, a topic, a measurable controlling idea, clear stance of first person and transition.	A1,A6,A7 ,A8,A11, A20,A21, A22	Therefore , although school long holiday is needed by the students, but due to ineffectiveness school holiday should be no more than two weeks.(A11) Average ThS but no clear stance of the first person and the absence of verb believe, or think, clear CI.
Good	14	complete sentence, a topic, a measurable controlling idea, clear first stance and marked with transition at the beginning	A2,A3,A4 ,A5A10,A 13,A14,A 15,A17,A 18,A19,A 22,A24,A 27	Although students need longer holiday, I consider that holiday should not be more than two weeks because it can decrease students’ motivation for school. (A4) Good ThS , clear stance of other and personal stance but too specific of CI.
Very good	3	complete sentence, a topic, a measurable and logical controlling idea, clear stance of both parties, and acceptable transition	A12,A25, A26	Although some students feel that long school holiday is really good because it gives a lot of free time, I believe that school holiday should not more than two weeks because it has some disadvantages for students. (A12) Very Good ThS , clear stance of both first and third and clear CI.
Excellent	0	complete sentence, a topic, a logical measurable controlling idea, clear stance of both parties, and clear transition		

Appendix 4 Body Paragraph 1

Table 4. summary of body paragraph quality

Quality	Frequency	Descriptor	Code	Sample
Poor	0	Flaws sentence, no clear controlling idea, no clear stance		<i>Not found</i>
Average	6	Complete sentence with minor flaws, a topic, a controlling idea, no stance of both parties, but connected to Thesis Statement.	A1, A3,A19,A20,A25, A16	<i>The first is when the students have along holiday of course they will be very happy. (A1)</i> Average TS and not clear stance connected with CI= some reasons= very happy <i>It must be inspiration. (A1)</i> Average CS does not have clear stance and essence of TS. Aspects of controlling ideas of TS is not developed.
Good	21	Complete simple sentence with minor flaws, a topic, a measurable controlling idea, clear stand of third party, connected to Thesis Statement.	A2,A4,A6 ,A7,A8,A9,A10,A11,A12,A13,A14,A15,A17,A18,A21,A22,A23,A24,A25,A26,A27	<i>My first opponent stated that the more days students get for holiday, the more they will study they have learnt at school.</i> Good TS , opposite the 1 st person, CI = they will study more <i>In the end these students will only paly rather than study which cause them all forget the materials that have learnt at school before.</i> Good CS , but not clear stance (first or third)The flow is not argumentative.
Very good	0	Complete complex sentence, a topic, a controlling idea, clear stand of third party, connected to Thesis statement	none	Not found
Excellent	0	Complete compound complex sentence, a topic, a measurable controlling idea, clear stand of third party, connected to ThS.	none	Not found

Appendix 5 Body Paragraph 2

Table 5. summary of body paragraph quality

Quality	Frequency	Descriptor	Code	Sample
Poor	0	Flaws sentence, not clear controlling idea, no clear stance.		<i>Not found</i>
Average	7	Complete sentence with minor flaws, a topic, a controlling idea, no stance of both parties, but connected to Thesis Statement.	A1,A3,A6 ,A7,A9,A20, A25	As we know, holiday is needed for students. (A7) Average TS and not connected with ThS, not clear stance, CI= needed for students. If the holiday more than two weeks, it is possible the schedule will be late (a7) Average CS ; Not clear CS and stance
Good	20	Complete simple sentence with minor flaws, a topic, a measurable controlling idea, clear stand of third party, connected to Thesis Statement.	A2,A4,A5 , A8, A10,A11, A12,A13, A14,A15, A16,A17, A18,A19, A21,A22, A23,A24, A26,A27	My second opponent also stated that long holiday will increase students' concentration later at school after some refreshment. (A4) Good TS and connects with ThS, third person stance, CI= increase students' concentration. The result in the end, the students can not catch up with the learning process in the class. (A4) Good CS , but not clear stance
Very good	0	Complete complex sentence, a topic, a controlling idea, clear stand of third party, connected to Thesis statement		Not found
Excellent	0	Complete compound complex sentence, a topic, a measurable controlling idea, clear stand of third party, connected to ThS.		Not found

Appendix 6 Concluding paragraph

Table 6. summary of concluding paragraph quality.

Model of Summary	Frequency	Major transition /frequency	Description of quality
Inductive	14	To sum up / 8, Finally /1, In summary / 1, No transition / 4 ,	4 good summaries, 4 good summaries but without transition, 3 average summaries, 1 poor summary.
Deductive	13	In conclusion / 9 As result / 2, To sum up / 1, Not clear /1,	3 are good conclusions, and 10 are average conclusions, Followed by 4 good summaries and 6 average summaries